

WebPanel 1. Guidelines for translocations

Translocation of living organisms attempts to establish or re-establish viable, free-ranging populations of threatened species (IUCN 1998). Since the first projects were conducted at the beginning of the 20th century, translocations have become a very popular tool but have yielded low rates of success (Seddon *et al.* 2007). In response to the increasing occurrence of translocations worldwide, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) developed a Position Statement on the Translocation of Living Organisms in 1987. Subsequently, the IUCN/Species Survival Commission (IUCN/SSC) established the Re-introduction Specialist Group (RSG) in 1988. The RSG updated the IUCN's 1987 Position Statement on the Translocation of Living Organisms and formulated the IUCN/SSC Guidelines for Re-introductions (IUCN 1998) in order to ensure that "reintroductions are both justifiable and likely to succeed and that the conservation world can learn from each initiative, whether successful or not." The IUCN/SSC Guidelines for Re-introductions establish several recommendations subdivided in activities that should be performed during the pre-project, planning, preparation, release, and post-release stages of a given reintroduction project. After the first statement of the IUCN was released, some authors have published recommendations that reinforce and complement the IUCN/SSC Guidelines for Re-introductions. Along with the IUCN (1987, 1998) guidelines, 11 additional publications are recognized as providing guidelines to improve the practice and results of translocations (WebTable 1). These works include reviews of case studies, translocations of a specific taxonomic group, or a specific issue associated with translocations (such as disease). These recommendations should be considered when deciding whether to translocate a particular species, as well as when assessing essential aspects in the design and development of a translocation project. We grouped these recommendations into 10 main criteria (WebTable 1).

WebPanel 2. Scientific literature

We searched for the terms "reinforcement", "reintroduction", "restocking", and "translocation" in eight major ecology and conservation journals during a consecutive 15-year period (1996–2010) using the online database ISI Web of Knowledge (www.isiwebofknowledge.com) (WebTable 2). In our analysis, we included only conservation-oriented translocations, leaving aside translocations with other aims (such as restocking of game species and translocation to solve human–animal conflicts).

WebPanel 3. Translocations in Spain

Translocation projects carried out in Spain during the past two decades (WebTable 3) were reviewed in the scientific and popular literature, Red Data Books, and web searches, as well as obtained from scientists, conservation managers, and naturalists, and our own knowledge. Preliminary lists on the conservation of different taxa were also checked by experts. Only projects with explicit conservation aims were considered, leaving aside restocking projects for game or sportfish species and translocations to solve human–animal conflicts. One expert was selected to evaluate each project. Selected experts were scientists or managers (1) with scientific backgrounds in, experience in, and knowledge of the ecology and conservation of the target species and (2) were familiar with the assigned reintroduction project but had no conflict of interest with its design or development. Contact with prospective experts was made via telephone before sending each expert a questionnaire for project evaluation via e-mail. Frequent reminders were sent, and alternative experts were selected if no response was received after two months, resulting in a fairly high participation rate (107 projects evaluated by 56 experts; WebTable 3). Refusals mostly resulted from deficiencies in the information available about the translocation project.

The questionnaire comprised 36 questions to evaluate each of the 10 criteria proposed (WebTable 4), as well as questions aimed at corroborating the expert's knowledge and his/her involvement in the conservation and translocation of the target species. Selected experts who completed the questionnaires declared a high level of knowledge on the ecology of the species (mean = 11.22 years of experience), a low link with the translocation project (range = 0–10, mean = 1.59), and a medium level of knowledge of the translocation project (range = 1–5, mean = 2.48). Respondents provided low scores regarding the public availability of information on the projects evaluated (range = 1–10, mean = 3.12).

WebPanel 4. Assessment of the level of accomplishment per criterion for Spanish translocation projects

The level of accomplishment for each criterion was evaluated according to the scores obtained in the survey (S_c). We scored each criterion using up to five questions from the survey (WebTable 4). Each question had up to 10 subquestions and had from 3 to 10 possible responses (WebTable 4). We scored each question (S_q) from 0 to 1, with “0”, meaning that the topic being asked about was not considered/not accomplished in the project and “1” meaning that it was accomplished (WebTable 4). We considered that a criterion was positively evaluated when S_c was 0.5 or more. The following formulas and decision diagrams were used to calculate S_c :

– *Criterion 1:*

$$\text{For question 4's answer } \begin{cases} = \text{No} & S_c = 0 \\ \text{else} & S_c = \sum S_{q_{4-6}} \end{cases}$$

where $S_{q_{4-6}}$ is the score of questions 4, 5, and 6.

– *Criterion 2:*

$$\text{For question 7's answer } \begin{cases} = \text{Yes} & S_c = 1 \\ \text{else} & S_c = \sum S_{q_{7-9}} \end{cases}$$

where $S_{q_{7-9}}$ is the score of questions 7, 8, and 9.

– *Criterion 3:*

$$S_c = \left(\sum S_{q_{11-16}} \right) * S_{q_{18}}$$

where $S_{q_{11-16}}$ is the score of questions 11, 14, 15, and 16, and $S_{q_{18}}$ is the score of question 18. We used the scores shown in WebTable 5.

– *Criteria 4, 5, and 6:*

$$S_c = \frac{\sum S_{q_{22-24,i}} + S_{q_{22-24,j}}}{n}$$

where $S_{q_{22-24,i}}$ is the score of subquestions 22.1, 23.1, and 24.1 for *criterion 4*; 22.3, 23.3 and 24.3 for *criterion 5*; and 22.5, 23.5 and 24.5 for *criterion 6*; $S_{q_{22-24,j}}$ is the score of subquestions 22.2, 23.2, and 24.2 for *criterion 4*; 22.4, 23.4, and 24.4 for *criterion 5*; and 22.6, 23.6, and 24.6 for *criterion 6*. To score each of these subquestions, we used the following decision diagram (for example, here is the decision diagram to calculate the score of $S_{q_{22-24,i}}$ for *criterion 4*):

$$\text{If subquestions 22's answer } \begin{cases} = \text{No} & S_c = 1 \\ \text{else} & S_c = \sum S_{q_{22-24}} \end{cases}$$

where $S_{q_{22-24}}$ is the score for the two subquestions of questions 22, 23, and 24 for each criteria (for example, 22.1, 22.2, 23.1, 23.2, 24.1, and 24.2 for *criterion 4*).

– *Criterion 7:*

$$S_c = S_{q_{25}} * \sum S_{q_{26,i}}$$

where $S_{q_{25}}$ is the score of question 25, and $S_{q_{26,i}}$ is the score of subquestions 26.1 to 26.10.

– *Criteria 8, 9, and 10:*

$$S_c = \frac{\sum S_{q_i}}{n}$$

where S_{q_i} is the score of the different questions of the survey used in each criterion and n is the number of questions or subquestions used to evaluate each criterion.

WebTable 1. Criteria for translocations obtained from recommendations regarding main guidelines for translocations

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Criteria</i>
Translocations are recommended for globally or locally extinct species (IUCN 1987, 1998).	1. Is the species or population under threat?
Translocations should only be attempted when the factors that caused the species' decline are known and either controlled or eliminated (IUCN 1987, 1998; Kleiman 1989; Dodd and Seigel 1991; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999).	2. Have the threatening factors been removed, or controlled or were they non-existent in the release area?
Translocations are useful tools when there is a need to augment wild population (IUCN 1987, 1998; Kleiman 1989; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994), eg a small population is becoming dangerously inbred, or a population has dropped below critical levels and recovery by natural growth will be dangerously slow, or where artificial exchange is required to maintain gene flow between small isolated populations on biogeographical islands (IUCN 1987).	3. Are translocations the best tool to mitigate conservation conflicts?
The survival of the wild population of an endangered species should never be jeopardized by a translocation (Kleiman 1989; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994). It is important to consider disease transmission (IUCN 1987, 1998; Kleiman 1989; Dodd and Seigel 1991; Stanley-Price 1991; Cunningham <i>et al.</i> 1996; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999), population genetics (Williams <i>et al.</i> 1988; Dodd and Seigel 1991; IUCN 1987, 1998; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999), social disruption (IUCN 1998), and behavioral and morphological characteristics (Kleiman 1989). The source population should ideally be closely related genetically to the original native stock and show similar ecological characteristics to the original sub-population (IUCN 1987, 1998; Williams <i>et al.</i> 1988; Kleiman 1989; Stanley-Price 1991; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999). If captive stock is to be used, it must be from a population that has been successfully managed, both demographically and genetically (IUCN 1987, 1998; Williams <i>et al.</i> 1988; Stanley-Price 1991; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999). Removal of individuals for translocation must not endanger the captive stock population or the wild source population (Kleiman 1989; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994; IUCN 1998).	4. Are risks for the target species acceptable?
Translocations must take into account the risks to other sympatric species (Stanley-Price 1991; Cunningham <i>et al.</i> 1996; Wolf <i>et al.</i> 1996) or the ecosystem (Cunningham <i>et al.</i> 1996; IUCN 1998), through, for example, disease transmission (Stanley-Price 1991), hybridization (Williams <i>et al.</i> 1988), and impacts on the habitat (IUCN 1998).	5. Are risks for other species or the ecosystem acceptable?
Care should be taken to ensure that released individuals are not dangerous to local inhabitants and their livestock (Stanley-Price 1991; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994; IUCN 1998). An examination of the socioeconomic aspects is necessary to understand the values, attitudes, and perceptions held by people involved with, and potentially influenced by, a translocation. If unfavorable, measures should be taken to make it acceptable to the people in the release area (IUCN 1987, 1998; Reading <i>et al.</i> 1991; Stanley-Price 1991).	6. Are the possible effects of the translocation acceptable to local people?

continued

WebTable 1. – continued

Recommendations	Criteria
<p>The habitat requirements of the species should be satisfied in the release area (IUCN 1987, 1998; Williams <i>et al.</i> 1988; Griffith <i>et al.</i> 1989; Stanley-Price 1991; Wolf <i>et al.</i> 1996). This requires detailed knowledge of both the needs of the species and the ecological dynamics of the release area (IUCN 1987; Kleiman 1989; Dodd and Seigel 1991; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999). Also, research into previous translocations of the same or similar species and experts should be contacted prior to and during development of a translocation project (IUCN 1987, 1998; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994). Important considerations include food availability, land cover, water sources, competitors, predators, and the presence of exotic species, as well as ecosystem resilience and the effects of disturbances such as fire, drought, catastrophic storms, etc. Some spatial considerations include the degree of isolation, and the size, and shape of the new location (Griffith <i>et al.</i> 1989; Reading <i>et al.</i> 1991; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999). It is advisable that there is sufficient unsaturated habitat (ie low densities, or none, of the species in the available habitat) within the species' historical range (Williams <i>et al.</i> 1988; Griffith <i>et al.</i> 1989; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994; Wolf <i>et al.</i> 1996; IUCN 1998; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999) and that the habitat has assured long-term protection (Williams <i>et al.</i> 1988; Kleiman 1989; Kleiman <i>et al.</i> 1994; IUCN 1998). Whenever necessary, habitat should be managed (eg predators, fire reforestation) to promote translocation success (Kleiman 1989; Reading <i>et al.</i> 1991; Stanley-Price 1991; Short <i>et al.</i> 1992; IUCN 1998).</p> <p>Managers should also select founder individuals that will survive best with the least preparation and cost. Some considerations include physical, behavioral, and genetic normality (IUCN 1987, 1998; Williams <i>et al.</i> 1988; Dodd and Seigel 1991; Reading <i>et al.</i> 1991; Stanley-Price 1991; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999), the absence of disease and parasites (IUCN 1987, 1998; Kleiman 1989; Dodd and Seigel 1991; Stanley-Price 1991; Cunningham <i>et al.</i> 1996; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999), and an optimal number and composition of individuals (eg sex ratio and age classes) (IUCN 1987, 1998; Griffith <i>et al.</i> 1989; Kleiman 1989; Reading <i>et al.</i> 1991; Stanley-Price 1991; Short <i>et al.</i> 1992; Wolf <i>et al.</i> 1996; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999).</p> <p>In the release strategy, it is important to consider the schedule of the translocation (Griffith <i>et al.</i> 1989; Kleiman 1989), the optimal number and composition of individuals to be released per year and the number of years that releases should occur in order to promote establishment of a viable population (IUCN 1998), the distance between the release sites (Kleiman 1989), and the timing of releases (eg season of the year) (IUCN 1987, 1998; Kleiman 1989; Stanley-Price 1991).</p> <p>It is usually advisable to habituate animals to release sites and to train them prior to release (eg to avoid predators, acquire and process food, interact properly with conspecifics, find or construct shelters and nests) (IUCN 1987, 1998; Kleiman 1989; Reading <i>et al.</i> 1991; Stanley-Price 1991; Short <i>et al.</i> 1992; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999).</p> <p>It is also important to develop a transport plan for delivery of stock to the translocation site (IUCN 1987, 1998; Short <i>et al.</i> 1992).</p>	<p>7. Does the project maximize the likelihood of establishing a viable population?</p>
<p>Goals should be defined carefully to provide accurate evaluation (Kleiman 1989; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999). Long-term post-release monitoring is required (IUCN 1987, 1998; Williams <i>et al.</i> 1988; Kleiman 1989; Dodd and Seigel 1991; Short <i>et al.</i> 1992; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999). It is important to monitor the health of individuals (Cunningham <i>et al.</i> 1996; IUCN 1998; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999), survival (IUCN 1998), causes of mortality (Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999), impacts on the habitat (IUCN 1998), collection and investigation of mortalities, individual adaptation (Kleiman 1989; IUCN 1998), population dynamics, and individual behavior (IUCN 1998; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999). Translocations must include an appropriate experimental design to identify the reasons for success or failure of the project (IUCN 1987, 1998; Short <i>et al.</i> 1992; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999). Efforts should be made to make information on both successful and unsuccessful translocations available (IUCN 1987, 1998; Williams <i>et al.</i> 1988; Miller <i>et al.</i> 1999).</p>	<p>8. Does the project include clear goals and monitoring?</p>

continued

WebTable 1. – continued

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Criteria</i>
Adequate funding must be available for all phases of the project (IUCN 1987, 1998; Kleiman 1989; Stanley-Price 1991; Kleiman et al. 1994; Miller et al. 1999). Professional training of individuals involved in the long-term program is essential. It is also important to have an appropriate organizational structure with a multidisciplinary team of well-trained individuals involved in the long-term program (Reading et al. 1991; IUCN 1998; Miller et al. 1999).	9. Do enough economic and human resources exist?
Translocations require the commitment and long-term support of all relevant government agencies and coordination and involvement of national and international conservation organizations (Kleiman 1989; Kleiman et al. 1994; IUCN 1998). Compliance with legislation and regulations of the release country translocations and to the target species is also essential (Kleiman et al. 1994; IUCN 1998). It is important to develop information and educational campaigns for the long-term support of local communities (Kleiman 1989; Reading et al. 1991; Kleiman et al. 1994; IUCN 1998). The involvement of local people is recommended when possible (Kleiman 1989; IUCN 1998).	10. Do scientific, governmental, and stakeholder groups support the translocation?

WebTable 2. Documentation sources, time period, and number of articles considered in the literature review used to analyze how scientific literature fulfilled the proposed criteria for translocations

	<i>Period</i>	<i>Number of articles</i>
<i>Animal Conservation</i>	1998–2010	43
<i>Biodiversity and Conservation</i>	1997–2010	12
<i>Biological Conservation</i>	1996–2010	122
<i>Conservation Biology</i>	1996–2010	33
<i>Ecological Applications</i>	1996–2010	13
<i>Journal of Applied Ecology</i>	1998–2010	11
<i>Oryx</i>	1998–2010	42
<i>Trends in Ecology and Evolution</i>	1996–2010	4
Total		280

WebTable 3. Description of the translocations and evaluated projects in Spain

	Number of projects	Number of projects evaluated (%)	Number of experts involved
Total	174	107 (61.49)	56
<i>Taxonomic group</i>			
Birds	94	61 (64.89)	32
Amphibians and reptiles	39	30 (76.92)	13
Mammals	9	5 (55.56)	4
Freshwater fish	32	11 (34.38)	7
<i>Threatened status</i>			
Not Threatened	16	7 (43.75)	6
Least Concern	79	44 (55.70)	31
Near Threatened	31	26 (83.87)	14
Vulnerable	24	15 (62.50)	9
Endangered	13	6 (46.15)	5
Critically Endangered	11	9 (81.82)	7
<i>Range</i>			
Local	14	9 (8.41)	7
Regional	106	64 (59.81)	40
National	4	3 (2.80)	3
Missing information	50	31 (28.97)	21

Notes: Threatened status according to IUCN (2010).

WebReferences

- Cunningham AA. 1996. Disease risks of wildlife translocations. *Conserv Biol* 10: 349–53.
- Dodd CK and Seigel RA. 1991. Relocation, repatriation, and translocation of amphibians and reptiles: are they conservation strategies that work? *Herpetologica* 47: 336–50.
- Griffith B, Scott JM, Carpenter JW, and Reed C. 1989. Translocation as a species conservation tool: status and strategy. *Science* 245: 477–80.
- IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature). 1987. IUCN position statement on translocation of living organisms: introductions, reintroductions and re-stocking. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
- IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature). 1998. IUCN guidelines for re-introductions. Gland, Switzerland, and Cambridge, UK: IUCN.
- IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature). 2010. IUCN Red List of threatened species. Version 2010.4. www.iucnredlist.org. Viewed on 9 Nov 2010.
- Kleiman DG. 1989. Reintroductions of captive mammals for conservation: guidelines for reintroduced endangered species into the wild. *BioScience* 39: 152–61.
- Kleiman DG, Price MRS, and Beck BB. 1994. Criteria for reintroductions. In: Olney PJS, Mace GM, and Feistner ATC (Eds). *Creative conservation: interactive management of wild and captive animals*. London, UK: Chapman & Hall.
- Miller B, Ralls K, Reading RP, *et al.* 1999. Biological and technical considerations of carnivore translocation: a review. *Anim Conserv* 2: 59–68.
- Reading RP, Clark TW, and Kellert SR. 1991. Towards an endangered species reintroduction paradigm. *Endangered Species Update* 8: 1–4.
- Seddon PJ, Armstrong DP, and Maloney RF. 2007. Developing the science of reintroduction biology. *Conserv Biol* 21: 303–12.
- Short J, Bradshaw SD, Giles J, *et al.* 1992. Reintroduction of macropods (Marsupialia: Macropodoidea) in Australia – a review. *Biol Conserv* 62: 189–204.
- Stanley-Price MR. 1991. *Animal re-introductions: the Arabian oryx in Oman*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams JE, Sada DW, and Williams CD. 1988. American Fisheries Society guidelines for introductions of threatened and endangered fishes. *Fisheries* 13: 5–11.
- Wolf CM, Griffith B, Reed C, and Temple SA. 1996. Avian and mammalian translocations: update and reanalysis of 1987 survey data. *Conserv Biol* 10: 1142–54.

WebTable 4. Survey questions used to assess the level of accomplishment of the criteria for translocations in Spain, along with the score for each response

Criteria	Survey question	Answer's score						
		A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7
1	4. Is the species or population in which the translocation project is developed in decline, threatened, or extinct?	0.6	0.4	–	0	0.2	–	NA
	5. Have studies been launched to determine the conservation status of the conservation unit?	0.2	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	6. Would it be advisable to develop studies to determine the conservation status of the conservation unit?	0	–	–	0.2	–	–	NA
2	7. Are the causes of the conservation unit decline known?	1	0.5	–	0	–	–	NA
	8. Have studies been launched to determine the causes of decline of the conservation unit?	0.125	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	9. Would it be advisable to develop studies to determine the causes of decline of the conservation unit?	0	0	–	0.125	–	–	NA
3	11. Besides translocation, what other measures are in development or proposed?*	–	–	–	–	–	–	NA
	14. Which of these measures are currently ongoing?*	–	–	–	–	–	–	NA
	15. In your opinion, is it necessary to develop other, non-manipulative measures?*	–	–	–	–	–	–	NA
	16. Do you consider it necessary to develop other manipulative measures?*	–	–	–	–	–	–	NA
	18. In your opinion, what should be the priority of the previously developed measures and your proposed measures?*	–	–	–	–	–	–	NA
4	22. In your opinion, does the translocation have or may there be a risk for:							
	22.1) the recipient population	0	–	0.5	1	NA	1	NA
	22.2) the source population	0	–	0.5	1	NA	1	NA
	23.1. Which of these risks have been considered in the translocation project?							
	23.1) the recipient population	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	23.2) the source population	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	24. Which of these risks is being controlled?							
	24.1) the recipient population	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA
5	22. In your opinion, does the translocation have or may there be risks for:							
	22.3) other species	0	–	0.5	1	NA	1	NA
	22.4) the ecosystem	0	–	0.5	1	NA	1	NA
	23. Which of these risks have been considered in the translocation project?							
	23.3) other species	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	23.4) the ecosystem	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	24. Which of these risks is being controlled?							
	24.3) other species	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	24.4) the ecosystem	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA

continued

WebTable 4. – continued

Criteria	Survey question	Answer's score						
		A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7
6	22. In your opinion, does the translocation have or may there be risks for:							
	22.5) human population	0	–	0.5	1	NA	1	NA
	22.6) conflicts with local communities	0	–	0.5	1	NA	1	NA
	23. Which of these risks have been considered in the translocation project?							
	23.5) human population	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	23.6) conflicts with local communities	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	24. Which of these risks is being controlled?							
	24.5) human population	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA
7	24.6) conflicts with local communities	0.25	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	25. Before intervention, was the project designed to maximize the likelihood of establishment of a viable population?							
	26. Which of these aspects were considered?	1	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	26.1) habitat availability	0.1	–	–	0	–	NA	NA
	26.2) habitat quality	0.1	–	–	0	–	NA	NA
	26.3) habitat protection	0.1	–	–	0	–	NA	NA
	26.4) availability of trophic resources	0.1	–	–	0	–	NA	NA
	26.5) number of individuals to release	0.1	–	–	0	–	NA	NA
	26.6) sex ratio	0.1	–	–	0	–	NA	NA
	26.7) age class	0.1	–	–	0	–	NA	NA
	26.8) spatial distribution of the animals	0.1	–	–	0	–	NA	NA
	26.9) release methodology (seasonality, release frequency, etc)	0.1	–	–	0	–	NA	NA
	26.10) adaptability of released individuals	0.1	–	–	0	–	NA	NA
8	27. Does the project include measurable aims?	1	–	–	0	–	–	NA
	28. Does the project include a monitoring phase?	1	–	–	0	–	–	NA
9	29. Does the project have sufficient economic resources for the phases of:							
	29.1) planning	1	0.5	–	0	–	–	NA
	29.2) release	1	0.5	–	0	–	–	NA
	29.3) post-release	1	0.5	–	0	–	–	NA
	30. And human resources?							
	30.1) planning	1	0.5	–	0	–	–	NA
	30.2) release	1	0.5	–	0	–	–	NA
	30.3) post-release	1	0.5	–	0	–	–	NA

continued

WebTable 4. – continued

Criteria	Survey question	Answer's score						
		A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7
10	31. How are these stakeholder groups involved in the project? [*]							
	31.1) local government	I	I	–	0	–	–	NA
	31.2) regional government	I	I	–	0	–	–	NA
	31.3) national government	I	I	–	0	–	–	NA
	31.4) European Union	I	I	–	0	–	–	NA
	31.5) international organization	I	I	–	0	–	–	NA
	31.6) NGO	I	I	–	0	–	–	NA
	31.7) scientific community	I	I	–	0	–	–	NA
	31.8) local community	I	I	–	0	–	–	NA

Notes: Answers: A1 = Yes, totally; A2 = Yes, partially; A3 = Could have; A4 = No; A5 = No information; A6 = Not relevant; A7 = Don't know/No answer; NA = Not Available. ^{*}For question 31: A1 = They develop; A2 = They know, support, and/or collaborate; and A4 = Not implicated. ^{††}For criterion 3, see score in WebTable 5.

WebTable 5. Scores of criterion 3 as a result of the evaluation of questions 11, 14, 15, 16, and 18 of the survey (see WebTable 4). Sq_{11-16} is the score of questions 11, 14, 15, and 16, and Sq_{18} is the score of question 18.

Is the translocation necessary? (Q16)	Are other conservation actions in development? (Q11, Q14)	Are other conservation actions necessary? (Q15, Q16)	Sq_{11-16}	Is translocation a priority measure? (Q18)	Are other conservation actions a priority? (Q18)	Sq_{18}
Yes	Yes	Yes	I	Yes	No	I
Yes	No	No	I	Yes	–	I
Yes	Yes	No	0.75	Yes	–	I
Yes	No	Yes	0.25	Yes	No	0.5
No	Yes	Yes	0.5	–	No	I
No	No	No	0.5	–	–	I
No	Yes	No	0.25	–	–	I
No	No	Yes	0	–	No	0.5
Yes	Yes	Yes	I	No	Yes	I
Yes	No	No	I	No	–	I
Yes	Yes	No	0.75	No	–	I
Yes	No	Yes	0.25	No	Yes	0.5
No	Yes	Yes	0.5	–	Yes	I
No	No	Yes	0	–	Yes	0.5